

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending.

Claims 10-15 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-6 and 8-9 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Thundat (US 5,719,324).

Claim 7 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Changes in the Claims:

Claim 7 has been canceled.

Claims 1-6 and 8 have been amended in this application to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention.

In particular, Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of allowable claim 7 therefore rendering claim 1 also allowable. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 USC §102(b) – claims 1-6 and 8-9

Claims 1-6 and 8-9 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Thundat (US 5,719,324). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A claim must be anticipated for a proper rejection under §102(a), (b), and (e). This requirement is satisfied “only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference”; see MPEP §2131 and *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A rejection under §102(b) may be overcome by showing that the claims are patentably distinguishable from the prior art; see MPEP §706.02(b).

Thundat describes a micro cantilever sensor. However Thundat does not teach or suggest a mobile support formed approximately at the center of a spiral beam shape.

In contrast, Claim 1 claims a biological or chemical analysis platform where a beam has a spiral shape and the mobile support is formed approximately at the center of the spiral. Thundat does not teach or suggest a biological or chemical analysis platform where a beam has a spiral shape and the mobile support is formed approximately at the center of the spiral.

The presently claimed invention is, accordingly, distinguishable over the cited reference. In the view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that claims 1-6 and 8-9 are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion


For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that the amended claims are now in proper form, and that the amended claims all define patentable subject matter over the prior art. Therefore, Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Request for allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP

Dated: March 7, 2005



Thierry K. Lo
Reg. No. 49,097

THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP
PO Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel: (408) 292-5800
Fax: (408) 287-8040